

**MEETING OF THE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS  
AND LAND SURVEYORS**

**2535 Capitol Oaks Drive  
Third Floor Conference Room  
Sacramento, California, 95833**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2010, beginning at 9:00 a.m.**

**Board Members Present:** Mike Modugno, President; Jerry Silva, Vice President; Kim Blackseth; James Foley; David Luzuriaga; Philip Quartararo; Ray Satorre; Patrick Tami; and Paul Wilburn.

**Board Members absent:** Michael Trujillo

**Board Staff Present:** David E. Brown (Executive Officer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Manager); Joanne Arnold (Assistant Executive Officer); Linda Brown (Administrative Manager); Paula Brown (Associate Information Systems Analyst); Paula Bruning (Board Liaison); Susan Christ (Staff Civil Engineer); Mike Donelson (Staff Electrical Engineer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Manager); Joyce Hirano (Staff Civil Engineer); Ric Moore (Staff Land Surveyor); Larry Kereszt (Geology & Geophysics Program Lead); Debbie Thompson (Budget Analyst); and Gary Duke (Legal Counsel).

**I. Roll Call to Establish a Quorum**

The meeting was called to order by President Mike Modugno. Roll call was taken, and there was not a quorum.

**II. Public Comment**

Joan Al-Kazily of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) stated that 36 states have adopted the continuing professional competency requirements from NCEES. ASCE is a strong supporter of this and has established a committee to study the issue with a view to implementing the requirements in California.

Steven Hamamoto read the letter he submitted to the Board regarding problems he encountered with the California state-specific Structural Engineering examination and the new NCEES registration requirements. He stated that he qualified to appeal the state-specific exam he failed; however, he was advised by

staff not to do so. He signed up to take the October 2010 state exam but did not register for the NCEES exam so he was not admitted to the NCEES examination. He feels that he has been treated unfairly.

President Modugno commented that the Board will be discussing the NCEES requirements during closed session. He urged Mr. Hamamoto to register with NCEES.

Mr. Hamamoto stated NCEES has been no help at all and he has no faith in their new examination.

Mr. Brown commented that Mr. Satorre and Mr. Blackseth joined the meeting, and a quorum was now established.

Annette Lockhart, a Sacramento land surveyor, appeared and complemented the smooth process at the Sacramento site for the October 2010 examination. She further stated that the local chapter of the California Land Surveyors Association (CLSA) has provided a free lunch for LSIT and LS candidates on Friday and Saturday of the exam for the last two years. However, at the recent exam, the Cal Expo representatives had an issue with this practice. Although they did end up allowing it, Ms. Lockhart would like the Board to assist in allowing CLSA to use the space cooperatively. Mr. Brown stated the issue would have to be looked into further as there may be prohibitions with concessions.

Ms. Lockhart next brought up the issue of her address on the Board's website. She indicated that she works for a state agency where they had a disgruntled employee that obtained her address from the Board's website. She disputed the need for her address to be made public and thought it would be more useful to list an e-mail address or telephone number for consumers to reach her. Mr. Duke stated that licensees choose which address they would like to list as their address of record, and that under the Information Practices Act, the address of record is public information. Ms. Eissler further stated that posting the information on the Board's website is in statute.

Mr. Foley suggested that she obtain a post office box. Mr. Modugno directed staff to place the issue on a future agenda.

### **III. DCA Director Updates**

Bill Young, Chief Deputy Director of Department of Consumer Affairs, appeared on behalf of Director Brian Stiger. He stated the hiring freeze implemented August 31, 2010, is a hard freeze. However, there is an exemption process for the purposes and benefits of boards' licensees, and this Board was successful in its request for proctors for the October examinations. The freeze will continue through this administration, but there is no information about what will happen with the incoming administration.

Mr. Young offered an update to the Consumer Protection Enforcement Initiative (CPEI). He stated there has been a completion of the performance measurement data, which includes such things as complaint intake cycle, average costs, and customer satisfaction. For purposes of transparency, the information will be placed on the Board's and DCA's websites. More data will be forthcoming to determine ways to improve efficiency and timing of processing complaints.

Mr. Young stated the BreEZe project is achieving key milestones. He indicated that DCA's Chief Information Officer, Debbie Balaam, is available to provide a presentation at board meetings. He also indicated that webcasting is available through DCA for board meetings at no cost to the boards, which aids in continuing transparency. Mr. Silva indicated he would like to build webcasting into the strategic plan. President Modugno directed staff to schedule Ms. Balaam's presentation for an upcoming meeting.

President Modugno commented that the monthly Board Chair/President conference calls with the Executive Unit of DCA are very useful. Mr. Young stated that he would take that comment back to Director Stiger.

President Modugno inquired as to the process and timing advised for hiring a new Executive Officer in consideration of the incoming administration. Mr. Young responded the Board would need to make a decision on timing with its own needs in mind. He indicated that an exemption request would be necessary; however, the position is a key management function, and such a request would be reasonable.

#### **XVIII. California Green Building Standards Code – CALGreen Presentation**

Mr. Donelson introduced Enrique Rodriguez of the Building Standards Commission (BSC), who presented information and history on the non-residential 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) which goes into effect on January 1, 2011.

In 2004, Executive Order S-20-04 established a goal of reducing grid-based electricity by 20% by 2015. AB 32 was aimed at reducing greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020. Agencies involved in the development of the CALGreen Code include the BSC, Housing and Community Development, Division of State Architect (DSA), and Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.

Mr. Rodriguez provided an overview of the regulation process. Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations contains the CALGreen Code. BSC is mandated to adopt new model codes every three years.

Mr. Rodriguez shared highlights from the Guide to the (Non-Residential) California Green Building Standards Code manual, which includes intent,

interpretations, how to comply, a series of self-certification forms, and worksheets that can be submitted to the building departments. The code and manual can be downloaded from the BSC website at [www.bsc.ca.gov](http://www.bsc.ca.gov).

Mr. Rodriguez responded to questions from President Modugno. He indicated that information pertaining to mechanical and electrical components refer to the Energy Commission portion of Title 24. He stated that DSA adopted certain mandatory code provisions and CALGreen does not include this. Review of the matrix is needed to determine which agency has adopted the particular code provisions in question.

Mr. Tami inquired if the new rules require a review and preparation by an electrical engineer. Mr. Rodriguez replied there is one portion under Commissioning of Buildings that requires “trained personnel.”

Mr. Satorre asked if the building code will be affected by use of alternatives such as solar energy. Mr. Rodriguez responded that the use of solar is under the jurisdiction of the Energy Commission.

The Board thanked Mr. Rodriguez for his presentation.

Mr. Luzuriaga joined the meeting.

Mr. Modugno presented a gavel plaque to Mr. Blackseth. The Board thanked Mr. Blackseth for his hard work as the immediate past President.

Mr. Modugno called for any further public comments. After hearing none, the Board took a short recess before convening into closed session.

- VI. Closed Session – Personnel Matters, Examination Procedures and Results, Administrative Adjudication, and Pending Litigation (As Needed) [Pursuant to Government Code sections 11126(a) and (b), 11126(c)(1), 11126(c)(3), 11126 (e)(1), and 11126(e)(2)(B)(i)]**
- a. Discrimination Complaint (Authority for Closed Session Discussion pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e)(2)(B)(i))**
  - b. Rodolfo Ventura Dimalanta v. Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG10513640.**
  - c. Examinations**
  - d. Executive Officer**

**VII. Open Session to Announce the Results of Closed Session**

Ms. Eissler reported the Board in closed session discussed possible litigation as noticed, examination matters, and adopted 13 stipulations, 5 default decisions, and 1 proposed decision. Mr. Duke indicated the Board also discussed the Executive Officer position.

#### **XIV. California State-Specific Structural Engineering Examination (Possible Action)**

Mr. Brown provided an overview of the structural examinations. He stated the two exams are a national (8-hour National Structural II) exam and a state-specific (8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic) examination. The Board recently adopted the use of the newly-developed NCEES 16-hour National Council Structural examination, which replaces the former 8-hour National Structural II and the 8-hour California state-specific examinations. However, the Board was not successful in changing legislation which requires the administration of a state-specific examination covering the state laws, rules and regulations and seismicity unique to California (B&P Code Section 6763.1). Staff is putting together a timeline to develop an occupational analysis that outlines requirements for the California examination. Once the occupational analysis is completed, then the format, length and content of the examination can be developed. Mr. Brown suggested FAQs be developed for the website outlining expectations for the April 2011 examination.

Mr. Foley recalled the Board's failed attempt to remove the requirement of a state-specific examination through an omnibus bill. He suggested removing the language using the structural engineering associations as advocates for it. Mr. Tami questioned what the Board should do for April since the occupational analysis will not be completed before then.

Ms. Arnold stated the Structural Engineering Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the 16-hour National Council Structural examination and determined it met the California component. However, it did not relieve the need for a California administered examination, which is required by law; therefore, the idea of a take-home examination was generated. Mr. Foley objected to the use of the take-home examination.

President Modugno inquired about the consequences if the Board only offers the examination once a year. Ms. Arnold and Ms. Christ replied it is offered similarly now because the 8-hour supplemental California Structural Engineering Seismic examination is offered once a year in October and the NCEES 8-hour National Structural II examination is offered twice per year in April and October. It takes a structural engineering candidate a year to get licensed in California. The offering of the new National Council Structural examination would begin in April 2011 and would be a two-day examination. If the California state-specific examination is 8 hours, then structural engineering candidates have to take 24 hours of examinations.

President Modugno asked what the take-home examination would include and how long it needs to be. Mr. Moore replied that staff needs to compare the test plan for the 16-hour National Council Structural examination to what is needed to cover the requirements of B&P Code Section 6763.1 to determine the content of

the new California supplemental examination. The necessary length of the examination is not yet known. The current take-home examinations for the Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor candidates are each 25 multiple choice questions. Mr. Brown stated that a test plan is needed first; however, it may be possible to use the old test plan.

Mr. Tami indicated there were 25 California Structural Engineers on the NCEES committee that created the 16-hour National Council Structural examination.

More questions arose from the Board members regarding examination content, including whether or not the candidates would be tested on seismicity in structural engineering unique to California.

Mr. Wilburn suggested the California supplemental examination not be very lengthy or thorough since it is assumed most of the necessary material will be covered on the 16-hour National Council Structural examination. Offering the California supplemental examination will be like going through the motions until the language is removed from B&P Code Section 6763.1. He further stated it would not be necessary to offer a new California supplemental examination in April since it is not traditionally offered during that time of the year. Mr. Tami suggested the Board continue utilizing the 8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic examination, resulting in candidates taking 24 hours of examinations. Staff responded that would cost more time and money because of grading, appeals, and renting space an extra day.

Mr. Moore also indicated another consideration is the higher cost of new 16-hour National Council Structural examination twice a year. He questioned whether or not the Board still wanted to offer the examination twice a year.

Ms. Christ indicated that the state-specific examination needs to have a test plan and be legally defensible. The test plans for current 8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic and the new 16-hour National Council Structural examination cover the same material. The idea is to conduct an abbreviated methodology to do the occupational analysis for the California specific examination; create a test plan; develop a shorter, multiple-choice examination; and have it ready to administer in Fall 2011. It could be a computer-based examination offered during a specific window of time. Mr. Tami stated the old test plan should still be applicable and questioned the need for a new one. Ms. Christ stated the 16-hour National Council Structural examination tests on the International Building Code, and the California specific examination could test on California Building Codes.

Mr. Tami asked if this can all come together by October. Ms. Christ replied that it could, and that normally development begins in February for the October examination. Mr. Brown clarified it would not require a start-from-scratch development.

Mr. Tami indicated that the testing information needs to be provided to candidates in enough time for them to study. He stated that a take-home or computer-based examination can easily be written and offered five times a year. Mr. Foley suggested the examination not be offered at all to attract organizations to help eliminate the requirement language in the law.

After discussion regarding the need to protect consumers, it was agreed that a person who passed the 8-hour National Structural II examination would be required to take the 8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic, and not be allowed to take the California supplemental take-home or computer-based examination. Ms. Christ also indicated that we would accept as comity a passing score from candidates who sit for the Washington state-specific examination (SE III).

Mr. Moore indicated there are potentially a few hundred candidates that passed the 8-hour National Structural II examination and would like to take 8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic examination. It may be possible to offer it at the Board office multiple times. However, a new examination is usually created for each offering, and there is also the cost of grading and appeals to consider.

Ms. Christ clarified the 16-hour National Council Structural examination is offered over two days, covers horizontal and vertical forces, and includes both multiple choice questions as well as a design portion. Appeals are allowed on this examination.

Mr. Foley asked if candidates could take the National Structural I examination for states that are discipline specific. Ms. Christ clarified the National Structural I examination is for entry level and has never been accepted for structural engineer candidates.

Mr. Brown requested that the Board approve a plan to accommodate the current law. The staff will work through the Sunset Review to get the law changed.

Mr. Wilburn recommended we maintain the detailed 8-hour California Structural Engineering Seismic examination for one or two more cycles. President Modugno suggested the examination continue to be offered to those that have already passed the 8-hour National Structural II examination.

Ms. Christ indicated that approximately 300 candidates take one or both of the examinations offered in October annually. She stated the Board could use the existing item bank and develop an 8-hour state multiple choice structural engineering examination. Mr. Moore stated if we offer a previously developed examination, we would avoid the cost of developing a new examination. President Modugno said that previous examination could be mixed to create a new test. Mr. Moore stressed the need to cover the overall test plan. Ms. Christ

stated the questions need to be revised to include the building codes changes that go into effect January 1, 2011. She stated that it would be inappropriate to give a test on obsolete building codes.

Mr. Blackseth left the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

**MOTION:** President Modugno/Mr. Silva moved that the Board offer the California Structural Engineering Seismic in-depth examination for one more cycle in October 2011 to those people that have passed the NCEES Structural II 8-hour examination and meet the other requirements of the state. Staff was directed that it be clearly noted on the Board's website and to the applicants that this will be the last time this examination will be offered. If they fail the examination, they will have to pass the 16-hour National Council Structural examination.

Mr. Brown asked if there would be comity issues. Mr. Moore stated it would be the same as the current requirement.

**VOTE:** 8-0, motion carried.

Mr. Moore suggested the take-home examinations be put on some kind of online system based on a sunset of the current test plan. Mr. Duke indicated it could be valid since test plans overlap. He reiterated the test must be legally valid and test candidates for entry level access into the profession of structural engineering.

**MOTION:** President Modugno/Mr. Wilburn moved that individuals who take the 16-hour National Council Structural examination be required to sit for a California-specific examination which would be developed by the Board and be computer based and represent California-specific code requirements. Staff will determine the specific detail and length of the examination.

**VOTE:** 6-1, motion carried. Mr. Foley opposed. Mr. Silva was temporarily absent.

Ms. Christ indicated the cost of the NCEES 16-hour National Council Structural examination would be higher. Ms. Thompson stated the Board has the funds for the new examination, but it leaves no surplus. The contract to develop the California structural engineering examination is built into the budget again. Mr. Moore commented the April examinations will be the two-day national test. The Board is only paying for examination books and scoring that are more expensive.



## **XII. Information Technology Updates (Possible Action)**

- **On-Line Renewals/Credit Card Renewals (Possible Action)**

Mr. Donelson indicated online renewals have been pushed back from December 2010 to January 2011 due to hold ups with the contracts for the credit card companies. The Physical Therapy Board is being used as the pilot for the project.

## **VIII. Executive Officer's Report**

### **A. Legislation**

1. Results of 2010 Legislative Session: AB 1431, AB 1659, AB 2038, AB 2130, SB 275, SB 294, SB 1111, SB 1491 and SB 1171 (Possible Action)

Ms. Arnold highlighted some of the bills that were signed by the Governor and chaptered, including AB 1431 which adds two more members to the Board and changes its name to the Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists effective January 1, 2011. In addition, she discussed AB 1659 and AB 2130 which recreates the Sunset Review Committee starting in February 2011, and SB 294 changes the sunset dates for some boards. SB 1491 is a Business & Professions (B&P) Committee omnibus bill which carried some of the Board's changes to several sections to prepare for the fee split. In addition, it made changes to allow applicants qualifying for EIT to use education or experience or a combination of both to qualify.

2. Legislative Proposals for 2011 (Possible Action)

Ms. Arnold stated that she will be meeting with Senate Business, Professions & Economic Development Committee consultants G.V. Ayers and Bill Gage at the beginning of December to discuss legislation for next year. There will be a separate bill to split the Board's fees and remove the section requiring a California Structural Engineering Seismic exam from statute (B&P Code Section 6763.1). She stated the Board does not have a lot of power when going through the Legislature, so if PECG or ACEC oppose, they can kill the bill. Including the issue in the sunset bill would help.

Mr. Silva suggested outreach regarding the structural engineering exam issue, educating the lawmakers.

Mr. Young commented that B&P 101.1 was removed when the Sunset Review Committee was reestablished. B&P 101.1 directed that any board that did not receive a new sunset date would become a bureau. The intent does not appear to be to merely eliminate such boards. DCA is working with the Legislature and consultants to address this matter.

#### **IV. Mail Ballot Procedures in Administrative Disciplinary Matter (pursuant to Government Code Section 11526) (Possible Action)**

Ms. Eissler provided an overview of the information provided in the agenda packet. She stated the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) allows the Board to vote by mail ballot on whether to adopt or reject stipulations, default decisions, proposed decisions, and petitions for reconsideration of previously adopted decisions. The provision does not allow the members to discuss the decisions as they can during closed session meetings.

The staff is proposing the use of mail ballots due to the concern over the aging of enforcement cases, which is now an average of five years. Due to the Consumer Protect Enforcement Initiative, statistics are captured in a new way. Enforcement performance measures look at aging from the time the complaint investigation is initiated to the time the final decision of board becomes effective. DCA's target goal for processing cases is 12 – 18 months. One factor contributing to the aging of cases is Board meetings being held farther apart. DCA has recommended that all boards look at acting on disciplinary decisions by mail ballot, and possibly by electronic means in future as well.

Other benefits of mail ballot voting include getting matters resolved faster for licensees and consumers and shorter closed session meetings. As mentioned, a disadvantage of the mail ballot procedure is that members cannot discuss the cases or they would be in violation of the Open Meeting Act. Sometimes there are statutory time frames that require a vote by mail ballot due to the scheduling of Board meetings.

Three options were presented to the Board as an approach to handling disciplinary decisions: 1) approve all decisions as they come in by mail ballot unless there is a regularly scheduled meeting within the 10-day notice period; 2) continue processing cases in the current manner; or 3) schedule more Board meetings.

Mr. Duke stated that most boards offer three voting options on the mail ballot, as follows: 1) accept; 2) reject; or 3) hold for Board discussion, if time allows.

Vice President Silva indicated that he is troubled by the inability to discuss cases. Mr. Young commented that the mail ballots are a tool to expedite the process without compromising judgment. He stated most DCA boards use the mail ballot procedure, but they always reserve the right to discuss cases at a meeting. He further indicated that mail ballots are not for every circumstance.

Mr. Brown stated there are fewer meetings due to budget issues. Mr. Satorre commented the cost of the Board meetings is not too much.

Rob McMillan inquired if Board members can contact Board staff if they have questions about a mail ballot decision. Mr. Duke responded that Board staff could communicate with the members, but not facilitate discussions between members. He further stated it would be inappropriate for members to ask questions of staff in proposed decisions, unless it is regarding procedures.

Ms. Eissler stated there would have to be a response by a quorum of the Board. There will be cases where mail ballot is necessary due to time frames constrained by statutory time limits.

President Modugno recommended the Board continue having the option of mail ballots to streamline operation, but also add more dates to the Board calendar in Sacramento. Vice President Silva suggested the Board meet every other month or equal to six times a year. Mr. Wilburn agreed the Board should meet more often, but not just for disciplinary matters. He commented that voting by mail ballot for stipulations and default decisions would be more efficient.

#### **XI. 2011 Board Meeting Schedule (Possible Action)**

The members discussed scheduling meetings every other month. They directed staff to move the August meeting to either July 14<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> and add a meeting in September on either the 15<sup>th</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup>.

The Board recessed at 5:01 p.m.

**Thursday, November 18, 2010, beginning at 9:00 a.m.**

**Board Members Present:** Mike Modugno, President; James Foley; David Luzuriaga; Philip Quartararo; Ray Satorre; Patrick Tami; and Paul Wilburn.

**Board Members Absent:** Jerry Silva, Vice President; Kim Blackseth; and Michael Trujillo.

**Board Staff Present:** David E. Brown (Executive Officer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Manager); Joanne Arnold (Assistant Executive Officer); Linda Brown (Administrative Manager); Paula Brown (Associate Information Systems Analyst); Paula Bruning (Board Liaison); Susan Christ (Staff Civil Engineer); Mike Donelson (Staff Electrical Engineer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Manager); Joyce Hirano (Staff Civil Engineer); Ric Moore (Staff Land Surveyor); Larry Kereszt (Geology & Geophysics Program Lead); Debbie Thompson (Budget Analyst); and Gary Duke (Legal Counsel).

## **I. Roll Call to Establish a Quorum**

The meeting was called to order by President Modugno. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.

## **VIII. Executive Officer's Report**

### **C. Personnel/Enforcement/Exams/Licensing/Publications/Website**

#### *Enforcement*

Mr. Brown discussed the enforcement statistics from the agenda packet. He indicated the data collection system being utilized by DCA differs from the way staff collects data, and he urged the members to pay attention to the statistics issued by Board. Mr. Young confirmed that DCA starts the complaint processing clock from the time the complaint is received to the final outcome, including the time the case is under investigation and at the Office of the Attorney General (AG). The Legislature wants to know comprehensive timeframes. They are aware the time the case is at the AG's Office is out of the Board's hands and processing times need improvement. DCA considers the statistical results as an opportunity to ask for additional resources to reduce processing times.

In response to questions by the Board, Ms. Eissler stated most cases cannot be triaged for fast tracking because they can go in a different direction once the investigation is started. There are some cases, however, that are sent to the Department of Investigation immediately if it appears an undercover investigation may be necessary. She further indicated that utilizing a Board subcommittee to process complaints would cause problems with Board members needing to recuse themselves from making decisions on cases they investigated. She stated the Enforcement Unit is fully staffed for the engineer and land surveyor side, and the Geologists and Geophysicists Program remains separate for everything including complaints.

The idea of using arbitration was offered; however, Mr. Brown commented arbitrations are typically used for contractual issues, not for investigating negligence.

Roger Hanlin, CLSA, stated the association utilizes chapter practice committees to review complaints in an attempt to avoid formal complaints with the Board. Ms. Eissler stated the Board receives many complaints which have been reviewed by practice committees throughout the state. It is very helpful to receive the documented correspondence from these committees and the Board staff appreciate the assistance the committees provide.

#### *Website*

Mr. Tami stated he has received negative comments regarding the manner in which accusations are published on the website as a list instead of individually in the License Lookup search results. Mr. Brown indicated that the process for posting the accusations came from DCA. Mr. Duke added that accusations are a matter of public record and it is legal to publish them. He stated some boards post complete listings in chronological order on a continuous basis, while others link the information to License Lookup. Ms. Eissler added the Board is following the way in which the Department and the majority of its boards post the list and link it to License Lookup. She stated that many consumers do not know about the License Lookup feature, but they can find an individual on the list through an internet search engine.

Mr. Young stated that the individual boards can choose to post the accusations in the manner that best suits its consumers and licensees. The Board directed staff to link the accusations only through the License Lookup rather than including a separate list.

Mr. Foley suggested the Board require licensees to include information regarding the License Lookup feature in their contracts. Ms. Eissler indicated it may require a statutory or regulatory change to accomplish that. The Board directed staff to include discussion of changing the policy and possibly the regulations governing contracts on the next meeting agenda.

## *Publications*

Mr. Brown stated the newsletter is in its final edits and a draft should be available this month for comments. He indicated the disciplinary decisions are too numerous to include in the newsletter and would require their own publication. The newsletter is now issued in electronic format only to reduce costs associated with printing and postage; therefore, the newsletter refers readers to the website to see the disciplinary information.

President Modugno suggested that an article summarizing the number of actions taken be included in the newsletter to educate the profession about the Board's enforcement efforts.

### D. Structural Engineering Certification Board – Background and Position

Mr. Duke provided a brief background of the use of the "SECB" designation by members of the private organization, the Structural Engineering Certification Board (SECB) of Illinois who are licensed in California as Civil Engineers but not as Structural Engineers. Use of the acronym seems to conflict with California law because it refers to Structural Engineer, which is a protected title in the state of California. The SECB was notified the Board will not oppose or challenge the use of the "SECB\*" designation provided the asterisk is in place with appropriate information clarifying the engineer is not licensed as a Structural Engineer in California.

Ms. Eissler clarified that SECB is not a state license board, but a private organization. The problem came from Civil Engineers misrepresenting their certification status, causing consumer confusion.

A follow-up article has been drafted for the upcoming newsletter to clarify the outcome of the Board's findings.

### E. Plastic Identification Cards

Paula Brown delivered a history of licensee identification cards as outlined in the agenda packet. In brief, the Board began issuing plastic identification cards to licensees while the renewal period was four years. The license renewal period has since changed to a two-year cycle, requiring cards to be issued more frequently, in turn requiring more material, postage, and a full-time staff member. In addition, postage and staff expenses have risen, and the desktop machine has passed its useful life. All-in-all, the cost of producing the plastic cards has more than doubled since its inception, totaling approximately \$58,000 annually. The Board has not issued plastic identification cards for approximately six months due to diminished supplies that could not be replaced during the budget impasse. All licensees continue to receive paper identification cards.

Ms. Brown proposed contracting with an outside vendor who can offer plastic identification cards as an option to licensees for a fee of \$6. Board staff are working with the DCA Information Technology Unit on the detail of creating a file for the vendor to download the licensee database information. The target date of January 2011 has been delayed due to resource limits.

In response to questions by the Board, Ms. Brown indicated the plastic identification cards are not required, but are nice for the licensees since they do not wear out like the paper cards.

Mr. Tami suggested the Board research avenues to offer the cards in-house at a lower fee to save the licensees money and offset Board expenses. He stated the new printers are inexpensive and plug right into the computer, making downloads simple.

Mr. Brown indicated the Board does not have the statutory authority to charge a fee for this type of service. The cost of the new machine would have to be absorbed by the Board until the authority to charge was established through statute. In addition the machine would be considered an IT purchase, which is limited. Ms. Thompson added the cost would require a budget revision as well.

The Board discussed alternatives to having the DCA Information Technology Unit spend state resources to create downloadable files. Suggestions included having the vendor access information from the Board's website or having applicants provide the information directly to the vendor.

The Board was in consensus to discontinue issuing plastic cards and continue issuing paper cards only.

Mr. Satorre suggested DCA synchronize the layout and information provided on the identification cards for all the professional licenses under their umbrella. Mr. Young responded that DCA is happy to consolidate resources when there is a consensus among boards for such things; however, they do not want to infringe when not requested.

#### F. BPELSG Operational Changes

Mr. Brown stated effective January 1, 2011, the Board will have a new name and the addition of two new Board member positions to include the Geologists and Geophysicists Program. The Board's new name will be: Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists.

Linda Brown indicated staff is working with the building management to update the lobby and suite signs. The phone scripts are also being updated and abbreviated for ease of use. The Employment Development Department

is working on drafts of the licenses and renewal notices for staff review. The website is being updated to include the new name wherever it is used.

There is currently a 12 to 18 month supply of pre-printed envelopes with the Board's old name, which will be used before ordering new stock with the new name. In addition, new business cards will be ordered for Board members, the Executive Officer, and the Assistant Executive Officer only. All other staff will use their existing supply until exhausted.

Ms. Eissler commented the logo is being updated by the DCA Publications Unit to include geology. The updated Board seal has been received and includes the Board's new name; however, the picture remains the same. The seal is used on the Board's letterhead as well as the Board embosser, which is being ordered.

Mr. Foley stated the Board was going to order lapel pins based on the Board seal, and then it was postponed pending a new seal. He stated the cost would vary from \$1.39 to \$2.00 per pin, depending on the number of pins ordered, and would be spread out among the Board members. Each member could receive 10 to 20 pins and the remaining could be used for new Board members, employee recognition, or to give to others who provided good service to the Board. Since this is a voluntary project, there is no action required by the Board to move forward with this idea. Mr. Foley will work with Ms. Bruning on collecting updated information and providing it to the Board members for their decision on whether or not to place an order.

## **IX. Consideration of Rulemaking Proposals, as follows:**

- A. Approval and Adoption of Rulemaking Proposals relating to Approved Curricula and Waiver of Fundamentals Examination [Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 404, 424, 425, 438, and 460] (Possible Action)

Ms. Eissler provided a brief overview of the rulemaking proposal. She indicated some comments were received during the 45-day comment period. Some changes were made and the language was republished for a 15-day public comment period. One comment was received from a Professional Engineer requesting the Board include a reference regarding ABET, which is already included. The engineer also requested that staff include information regarding accreditation dates; however, staff views those items as under the purview of ABET, and they are not the Board's responsibility. Therefore, staff recommended that no further changes be made to the language and the Board, by motion, adopt the proposed changes and direct staff to finalize the rulemaking file for submittal.



**MOTION:** Mr. Foley/Mr. Tami moved to adopt the proposed changes to Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 404, 424, 425, 438, and 460 and direct staff to finalize the rulemaking file for submittal to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Office of Administrative Law for review and approval.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

B. Possible Amendments to Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 405 and 3004 – Delegation of Certain Functions (Possible Action)

Ms. Eissler provided an overview of the possible amendments to the regulations regarding delegation of authority. As part of the CPEI, the Department reviewed processes for increasing efficiency and recommended the boards delegate authority to the Executive Officer to accept, adopt, or reject default decision, stipulated settlement, and voluntary surrender cases, which would then not have to be presented to the board. To accomplish this, the Board needs to approve moving forward with this rulemaking proposal.

Mr. Satorre commented that authority can be delegated, but responsibility cannot.

Mr. Duke indicated the delegation would significantly speed up the process. For example, in cases where a licensee wants to surrender their license, the Executive Officer can accept the surrender instead of deferring the matter to the next meeting. Mr. Brown suggested the Board assign a liaison member to work with the Executive Officer initially. Mr. Young stated this is not a complete delegation but only for the uncontested types of events. The responsibility is still there; however, it is a tool for expediting enforcement cases.

Mr. Foley stated he views the review of the enforcement decisions as an educational component for the Board. He does not want to lose a feel for the enforcement process and the directions cases take. He stated this responsibility is a major function of the Board. Mr. Modugno also stated his appreciation for the process of hearing cases and feedback from the other members.

Ms. Eissler stated that, although the Board agreed to use mail ballots, this is a separate issue that would require approval by the Board to move forward with a rulemaking proposal.

The Board was in consensus to postpone proposing any amendments to delegate authority to the Executive Officer.

C. Possible Amendments to Title 16, California Code of Regulations Section 3005: Fees for Geology (Possible Action)

Ms. Thompson stated staff has reviewed the fund for the Geologists and Geophysicists Program and minutes of the former Board for Geologists and Geophysicists. The fees in regulation are not consistent with what is required in B&P Code Section 7887 relating to examination fees. The proposed amendments are to change the fees for the national examination to be consistent with the law requiring that the applicant be charged the actual cost of the examination. In addition, there was clean up completed of further inconsistencies as outlined in the agenda packet.

**MOTION:** Mr. Foley/Mr. Luzuriaga moved to direct staff to proceed with the rulemaking process to amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations Section 3005.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

**XV. Administration (Possible Action)**  
**A. Fund Condition (Possible Action)**

Ms. Thompson discussed the charts included in the agenda packet regarding the expenses from the AG's Office. Mr. Brown indicated the AG budget line item has been supplemented each year with savings found in other areas. That opportunity is not available this year, and staff has estimated there will be no money for these costs by February under the current process. He provided options for the Board to consider: 1) continue processing cases until the fund is depleted in February; 2) reduce the number of cases being processed so there is enough money to last through June; or 3) consider other opportunities in the budget process the Department can assist with.

Mr. Young suggested the Board request an increase in expenditure authority through the Sunset Review process and in the transition document. The Board has already demonstrated there is nowhere else to pull funds, is not requesting higher licensing fees, and needs to use reserves. The Board may also be able to ask for increased expenditures through the Spring Finance Letter for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board could borrow from the Geologists and Geophysicists Program budget. Mr. Young indicated doing so could cause problems with the Legislature.

Mr. Foley suggested canceling an exam to reserve money for the enforcement program since protection of the public is the Board's primary concern. Mr. Tami also offered ideas to save money in other areas.

Mr. Modugno inquired about the cost recovery. Ms. Eissler indicated cost recovery does not go into the Board's spending authority but into the reserve. The reserve can only be accessed through the budget process.

Mr. Brown stated the Board staff could continue processing cases; however, once the budget is exhausted, the AG's Office will discontinue processing and accepting cases. They charge time on an hourly basis.

Ms. Thompson indicated the Board was unable to obtain additional funding in previous years because the staff stopped sending cases to the AG when the fund was depleted so there was no documentation of the funding shortage. Since the Board overspent last year and is on target to do so this year, there is good justification in obtaining the increase through the Spring Finance Letter.

Mr. Young stated canceling the examination could be problematic. The Board received an exemption to hire proctors during the hiring freeze to administer the examination since licensing is viewed as a way to boost jobs and the economy.

Mr. Brown suggested the Board continue to send cases to the AG's Office and request an estimate from them on when they think the money will run out. In addition, the Board can work with the Department on the Spring Finance Letter and meet with members of the Board to review expenses. Mr. Young stated the Board could request a current year deficiency which builds a case for the need of an increase for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Wilburn inquired if the cost of the April 2011 examinations were already included in the budget. Ms. Thompson stated she has built the increased costs of the examination into the budget. In addition, there has been some savings since the number of candidates has begun to drop.

Ms. Thompson indicated she will move forward with preparing the Spring Finance Letter, which will be ready by January for submittal in February.

Ms. Thompson reported on the Fund Condition and noted a correction to the reported fund revenue received for the Geologists and Geophysicists' Fund: The total amount received should read \$286,376 instead of \$863,768.

Ms. Thompson indicated the Board still has a healthy reserve of more than six months. The current minimum number of months in reserve required is three to four months.

President Modugno requested the fund condition report include a line for cost recovery.

Ms. Thompson stated the Geologists and Geophysicists Program has a structural imbalance at this time and the reserve is dwindling. The proposed regulation changes would assist in relieving that along with staff's analysis of the expenditures. She projected additional revenue income as the Geologists and Geophysicists Program continues to align with the Board.

#### **B. FY 2010/11 Budget (Possible Action)**

Expense reports were not available due to the late signing of the budget.

#### **C. FY 2011/12 Budget Change Proposals (Possible Action)**

Ms. Thompson stated the State and Consumer Services Agency denied the BCP for hiring a Geologist Registrar for the Geology and Geophysicists Program. The reasons given were to hold the line for increasing expenditures and to avoid a fund imbalance. The program is currently contracting with a geologist as a subject matter expert similar to the way a land surveyor was contracted prior to receiving the Land Surveyor Registrar position.

### **XIII. NCEES National ID – Process and Lessons Learned (Possible Action)**

Mr. Moore and Ms. Hirano reported there were nearly 11,000 state and national examinations administered in October 2011, which is a 16 percent decrease from last year. There was a no-show rate of 16 percent. California accounted for approximately one-third of all of NCEES examinations given nationally.

The October 2011 examinations were the first to require registration for the online Examinee Management System. Unfortunately, many candidates do not know which examination they need, and various situations arose where candidates registered for the wrong examinations. Staff worked diligently to correct the problems and contact approximately 300 applicants; however, as of September 20, no more changes were allowed to the national examination registrations. There were a few candidates that did not register in time to sit for the correct examination. Special accommodation notices were created for applicants who needed state-only examinations.

Ms. Hirano stated efforts were being made to simplify the process to make it fool proof. In addition, changes to the Board's website were being made to make examination titles consistent with those on the NCEES website. Mr. Moore indicated other suggestions were made to NCEES to improve the process, such as making it impossible for a candidate to sign up for exams at two different locations on the same day. Mr. Moore reviewed further improvement suggestions from the agenda packet.

Mr. Brown indicated staff became completely adept at walking applicants through the process and were instrumental in helping to correct the issues.

Mr. Moore explained that NCEES ships the exact number of booklets needed for each registered examination candidate to the appropriate exam site, which is a reason they gave a cut-off date for registration. NCEES reported there were proportionally fewer California candidates with problems than in other states.

**X. Approval of Delinquent Reinstatements (Possible Action)**

Mr. Foley inquired as to why the Board would reinstate a Safety Engineer since we no longer issue new licenses in that discipline. Ms. Eissler responded the people who were licensed in disciplines that are no longer offered are authorized under the law to continue renewing the license. Delinquent reinstatements fall under the category of renewals.

**MOTION:** Mr. Foley/Mr. Satorre moved to approve the Delinquent Reinstatements in the agenda as follows:

**CIVIL**

**BAUMAN, JAMES**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination.

**GONSMAN, JAMES A.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**HAMPTON, JAMES E.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the seismic principles examination, the engineering surveying examination, and the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**MCCLURE, ROLAND D.**

Reinstate applicant's electrical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**NEMATI, KAMRAN M.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the seismic principles examination, the engineering surveying examination, and the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**SCHMIDT, ERIC J.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination.

**STANLEY, ROBERT M.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination.

**TERRY, LOLENE J.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the seismic principles examination, and the engineering surveying examination.

**CONTROL SYSTEM**

**HECHT, HERBERT**

Reinstate applicant's control system license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**ELECTRICAL**

**MINETTO, RICHARD, J.**

Reinstate applicant's electrical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**MECHANICAL**

**GRANT, TIMOTHY J.**

Reinstate applicant's mechanical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**JENSEN, GRANT C.**

Reinstate applicant's mechanical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**NOLAN, JAMES P.**

Reinstate applicant's mechanical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**SAFETY**

**CHIZEK, MARTIN S.**

Reinstate applicant's safety license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

**XVI. Reports from the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) (Possible Action)**  
**A. Board Assignments to TACs (Possible Action)**

Nothing to report.

**B. Appointment of TAC Members (Possible Action)**

Nothing to report.

**C. TAC Report (Possible Action)**

Mr. Brown stated the Geologist and Geophysicist TAC is scheduled to hold a meeting on December 15, 2010.

Mr. Tami requested a meeting of the Land Surveyor TAC in the near future.

Mr. Wilburn indicated Mr. Ball is interested in being reappointed to the Mechanical TAC.

**XVII. Liaison Reports (Possible Action)**  
**A. ASBOG (Possible Action)**

Nothing to report.

**B. ABET (Possible Action)**

Nothing to report.

### **C. NCEES (Possible Action)**

Mr. Donelson stated NCEES issued their annual engineering award brochure. Mr. Tami urged the professional associations to encourage California schools to apply for these monetary awards.

Mr. Brown stated NCEES has requested nominations for the Distinguished Service Award. Mr. Tami indicated California was not represented at the NCEES national meeting.

### **D. Technical and Professional Societies (Possible Action)**

Nothing to report.

## **XIX. President's Report/Board Member Activities**

President Modugno stated his appreciation for the assistance provided by DCA and stated the monthly Board Chair/President conference calls with the Executive Unit of DCA are a good vehicle to reach DCA on a consistent basis.

Mr. Luzuriaga indicated he spoke at the ASCE Riverside Chapter meeting. He further stated he received inquiries wanting to know what to do about businesses selling engineering services without a licensee. Ms. Eissler stated this information should be provided to the Enforcement Unit with as much detail and evidence as possible.

Mr. Luzuriaga requested the Professional Engineer application forms and instructions be streamlined. Ms. Eissler responded the staff is working on updating the instructions to match the new forms that went into effect recently.

Mr. Tami requested the completed Organization Record forms be placed online, similar to License Lookup. Ms. Eissler stated the new BreEZe program may incorporate a crosslink from the business information to the license information. It is important to note that although the Board posts important information regarding certain requirements for licensees on forming a business entity, the Board does not issue any type of certificate of authority to the business. Mr. Brown indicated that ideas for information technology improvements are being coordinated by Mr. Donelson.

## **XX. Other Items Not Requiring Board Action**

### **A. California Senate Resolution: Earth Science Week – October 10-16, 2010**

Mr. Brown shared that Senator Sam Blakeslee's office issued a proclamation for the geosciences professions titled Earth Science Week.



**B. Date of Next Board Meeting: Strategic Planning – February 9 & 10, 2011, San Diego, California**

The Board confirmed the meeting calendar for 2011 which was discussed on the first day of the meeting. The members requested a shift of future two-day meetings from Wednesday/Thursday to Thursday/Friday due to business scheduling conflicts.

**XXI. Approval of Consent Items (Possible Action)**

**(These items are before the Board for consent and will be approved with a single motion following the completion of Closed Session. Any item that a Board member wishes to discuss will be removed from the consent items and considered separately.)**

- **Approval of the Minutes of the August 11 & 12, 2010 Board Meeting**

**MOTION:** Mr. Tami/Mr. Satorre moved to approve the minutes of the August 11 & 12, 2010 Board Meeting.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

**XXII. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

**PUBLIC PRESENT**

Joan Al-Kazily, American Society of Civil Engineers

Brian Clifford, Department of Consumer Affairs

Robert DeWitt, ACEC California

Steven Hamamoto

Roger Hanlin, California Land Surveyors Association

Steve Hao

Annette Lockhart, California Land Surveyors Association

Richard Markuson, American Society of Civil Engineers

Jared Pratt, Association of Environmental and Engineering Geologists San Francisco

## **MOTIONS – NOVEMBER 17, 2010 BOARD MEETING**

**MOTION:** President Modugno/Mr. Silva moved that the Board offer the California Structural Engineering Seismic in-depth examination for one more cycle in October 2011 to those people that have passed the NCEES Structural II 8-hour examination and meet the other requirements of the state. Staff was directed that it be clearly noted on the Board's website and to the applicants that this will be the last time this examination will be offered. If they fail the examination, they will have to pass the 16-hour National Council Structural examination.

**VOTE:** 8-0, motion carried.

**MOTION:** President Modugno/Mr. Wilburn moved that individuals who take the 16-hour National Council Structural examination be required to sit for a California-specific examination which would be developed by the Board and be computer based and represent California-specific code requirements. Staff will determine the specific detail and length of the examination.

**VOTE:** 6-1, motion carried. Mr. Foley opposed. Mr. Silva was temporarily absent.

## **MOTIONS – NOVEMBER 18, 2010 BOARD MEETING**

**MOTION:** Mr. Foley/Mr. Tami moved to adopt the proposed changes to Title 16, California Code of Regulations Sections 404, 424, 425, 438, and 460 and direct staff to finalize the rulemaking file for submittal to the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Office of Administrative Law for review and approval.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

**MOTION:** Mr. Foley/Mr. Luzuriaga moved to direct staff to proceed with the rulemaking process to amend Title 16, California Code of Regulations Section 3005.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

**MOTION:** Mr. Foley/Mr. Satorre moved to approve the Delinquent Reinstatements in the agenda as follows:

**CIVIL**

**BAUMAN, JAMES**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination.

**GONSMAN, JAMES A.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**HAMPTON, JAMES E.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the seismic principles examination, the engineering surveying examination, and the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**MCCLURE, ROLAND D.**

Reinstate applicant's electrical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**NEMATI, KAMRAN M.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the seismic principles examination, the engineering surveying examination, and the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**SCHMIDT, ERIC J.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination.

**STANLEY, ROBERT M.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination.

**TERRY, LOLENE J.**

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the seismic principles examination, and the engineering surveying examination.

## **CONTROL SYSTEM**

### **HECHT, HERBERT**

Reinstate applicant's control system license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

## **ELECTRICAL**

### **MINETTO, RICHARD, J.**

Reinstate applicant's electrical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

## **MECHANICAL**

### **GRANT, TIMOTHY J.**

Reinstate applicant's mechanical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

### **JENSEN, GRANT C.**

Reinstate applicant's mechanical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

### **NOLAN, JAMES P.**

Reinstate applicant's mechanical license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

## **SAFETY**

### **CHIZEK, MARTIN S.**

Reinstate applicant's safety license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination, and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

**VOTE:** 7-0, motion carried.

## **ACTION ITEMS – NOVEMBER 17 – 18, 2010 BOARD MEETING**

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Modugno directed staff to place the issue of the address of record on a future agenda.

### **DCA Director Updates**

President Modugno directed staff to schedule Ms. Balaam's BreEZe project presentation for an upcoming meeting.

### **2011 Board Meeting Schedule**

The Board directed staff to move the August meeting to either July 14<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> and add a meeting in September on either the 15<sup>th</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup>. The Board also requested a shift of future two-day meetings from Wednesday/Thursday to Thursday/Friday due to business scheduling conflicts.

### **Personnel/Enforcement/Exams/Licensing/Publications/Website:**

The Board directed staff to include discussion of requiring licensees to include information regarding the License Lookup feature in their contracts on the next meeting agenda.

### **Fund Condition**

Ms. Thompson will move forward with preparing the Spring Finance Letter reading the AG line item deficiency, which will be ready by January for submittal in February.

President Modugno requested the fund condition report include a line for cost recovery.

### **TAC Report**

Mr. Tami requested a meeting of the Land Surveyor TAC in the near future.